

MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23RD, 2004

Commissioners Present: Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Annette Rose, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Larry Chu, Alternate, Larkspur City Council
Barbara Heller, Alternate, San Rafael City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Paul Albritton, Alternate, Sausalito City Council

Commissioners absent: Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Executive Director
Carey Lando, Senior Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Jack Baker, Senior Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

Chair Steve Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

1) Commissioner Matters Not On The Agenda

Chair Steve Kinsey congratulated Commissioner Pat Eklund on her recent appointment as the President, League of Cities.

Chair Kinsey said a major project of interest in Marin, the Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), reflected not only in the Sales Tax Expenditure Plan on the November, 2004 ballot but also in many other ways by actions of the former Congestion Management Agency, is *sponsoring International Walk (and Roll) to School Day* October 6, 2004. Wendy Kallins, Program Director of SR2S, urged each Commissioner to participate, and handed out informational packets.

As Commissioner on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Chair Kinsey explained that copious amounts of time has been spent on the seismic retrofit of Bay Area bridges, and was pleased to say that MTC was able to recede the suggestion from the Administration that Regional Measure 2 dollars be diverted into fixing the seismic retrofit program. Issues remain as to how MTC will proceed. Executive Director Craig Tackabery will be participating tomorrow with other Bay Area CMA's in understanding funding possibilities. Depending upon the financing solution, the extent to which our local portions of state transportation fund dollars being redirected into seismic retrofit is an issue. Another issue is the confusion and uncertainty of huge cost overruns and time delays which do not do anything to assist with local self-help measures. MTC is attempting to come up with a reasonable approach, by working with the Governor and the Secretary of Transportation.

2) Approval of TAM Minutes of July 22nd, 2004

Commissioner Eklund motioned to approve the minutes; Commissioner Murray seconded the motion. Commissioners Chu, and Butler abstained. Motion passed 9/2/5.

3) Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Craig Tackabery said that both Dean Powell and Bonnie Nelson were on well-deserved vacations, and therefore not in attendance tonight.

All Sales Tax Expenditure Plan information has been sent to the Registrar of Voters and will be presented as Measure A, the *Traffic Relief and Better Transportation Act*, on the upcoming ballot. Pamphlets, which include the entire Sales Tax Expenditure Plan, will be mailed by the Registrar of Voters on October 4th. There is a statewide initiative, #1-A, *Protection of Local Government Revenues*, which could possibly be cause for (voter) confusion. San Diego, Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Mateo, Ventura, San Bernardino, and Sonoma counties are also sponsoring sales tax measures on the upcoming ballot.

Executive Director Tackabery explained that effort has been expended to update TAM's web page, now offering all meeting agendas and staff reports on-line, reducing the costs of mass mailings. The entire Sales Tax Expenditure Plan is also available on-line, in its entirety, as well as an interactive website, which allows viewers to access information on how Sales Tax Expenditure Plan will benefit/impact each specific County community. In addition, Fact Sheets, Frequently Asked Questions, a PowerPoint Presentation, and the Administrative Code are also online. The County conducted an annual evaluation of the Safe Routes to Schools program, which is also now posted on the website.

TAM agenda item #4a. (i) should have used the following verbiage: *Request from Commissioner Murray to Appoint Professionals in the (Design) Field to Aesthetic Selection Subcommittee*. Executive Director Tackabery recommends a discussion only of this matter take place tonight, and reserve action until the October 28th, 2004 meeting.

4) Commissioner Reports

a. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group (PAG) – Commissioner Murray

Commissioner Murray said that at the August 19th meeting, an update of the project and the EIR was presented, and one of PAG's actions was to create a committee to deal with aesthetics concerning the design of the freeway overpasses. The October, 2004 meeting of PAG has been canceled. There may also be a problem with the November, 2004 meeting of PAG as it conflicts with the CSAC meeting, at which several County Supervisors plan to attend, thereby negating the number in attendance required for a quorum.

i. No action.

b. SMART

Commissioner Rose said that at the September 15th meeting, the SMART board approved an expenditure plan, and preliminarily agreed on ballot language for the ¼-cent transaction and use tax to be placed on the November, 2006 ballot. There was a reading of the sales tax ordinance. The absolute final language, however, was not agreed upon. The ordinance and the sales tax expenditure plan language can both be amended as late as August, 2006.

The reason preliminary ballot language was approved was due to the fact that Sonoma County wishes constituents to know that Marin County is on board with SMART's plan. Moreover, the SMART project has different types of state funding and it gives a greater level of comfort to funding agency staff members to know that much serious work has already been done, and that the intent is to see the project on the ballot.

Commissioner Rose said that a \$34,000 consultant's contract was approved to further some of the intensity-of-use issues next to SMART railroad stations.

Chair Kinsey said the ability to adjust and amend the expenditure plan for SMART (which is until August, 2006) will be useful in that SMART will soon be conducting community meetings to review the EIR, etc. Commissioner Rose said that some of SMART's future focus, based on the EIR and community meetings, is because the ordinance and plan language may change.

5) Caltrans Reports

Caltrans' Yader Bermudez introduced Julie Gumm, Traffic Operations Strategies Manager with Caltrans' Division of Operations, and Jit Pandher, Regional Project Manager, all of whom contributed to tonight's presentation.

There are 4 phases of the Marin 101 HOV Gap Closure Project: the Cal Park Hill Project is completed, the Corte Madera Project is on going, and two projects are awaiting funding: Puerto Suello Hill and Central San Rafael Projects. The overall cost is approximately \$112M, including \$72M for construction and \$40M for right-of-way.

The Corte Madera Project is 33% completed, with an expected completion date of May, 2005 at a cost of \$8M. The Puerto Suello Hill Project is awaiting Sales Tax Expenditure Plan funding to begin project construction, with an overall cost of approximately \$17M. The Central San Rafael Project's right-of-way process is being completed; the project's contract is ready to go, and advertising for bids is expected to take place in September, 2005, with an overall cost of approximately \$30M.

The 101/East Blithedale Project – a safety project – is expected to be delivered by July, 2005, with an overall cost of approximately \$5.8M. The Upgrade Median Barrier Project on Marin/Sonoma 101 corridor is at 97% completion, at an approximate overall cost of \$8.5M.

Regarding a public inquiry about the Caltrans SHOPP program auxiliary lanes at the July, 2004 TAM meeting, Mr. Bermudez explained that the spreadsheet utilized in the Congestion Management Plan presented was mislabeled. It was labeled as *2002 State Highway Improvement Plan*. After reviewing that plan, the auxiliary lanes were not included, nor was it included in the 2004 Plan. The auxiliary lane review and construction was listed in the long-term planning document, the *10-year SHOPP Plan*. Caltrans evaluates the listing of projects every two years, and will reassess priority and funding when necessary.

Commissioner Adams asked about the coordination efforts between SMART, the City of San Rafael, TAM and Caltrans regarding the gap closure between central San Rafael and Puerto Suello Hill, specifically related to bike/pedestrian access. Jit Pandher said many upcoming meetings have been scheduled to address the coordination efforts. Commissioner Adams reminded Caltrans that some issues, such as adjusting lane sizes, shifting of lanes, etc., were going to be worked on with SMART, and solutions would then be brought to TAM for Commissioner review. Executive Director Tackabery explained that one outstanding issue is that of the location of the soundwall. Caltrans has completed their design in conformance with their approved environmental document. SMART is also doing an

environmental document, which will show the soundwall in the location to the west of the tracks. We will soon receive details from Lillian Hames and her consultants as to what information we need to exchange. The next issue is the design of a bike trail. Ms. Hames has had her consultants draft a design. TAM staff will meet with Ms. Hames and the design team to determine the feasibility. It is very tight at this location; there are standard widths for bike trails/paths. We cannot evaluate a plan until all of the pieces have been received and reviewed; we are currently exchanging information in an effort to move toward evaluation. Mr. Tackabery said the project is programmed to follow the Central San Rafael Project. The money is not available in the STIP until July, 2006. He said he would like to see this resolved quickly and expects to have solutions within the next few months.

Commissioner Eklund asked that since the SHOPP Program items were reflected for 2009, were there any Marin SHOPP program items programmed for 2005-2006. Mr. Bermudez explained that was part of their presentation earlier this year, and that yes, there are Marin SHOPP items programmed for 2004-2005. He said projects listed are based on statewide competition and priority. Caltrans shares this information locally to receive input and support, and then they use that local support to try to get those projects included in the SHOPP program.

Mr. Bermudez showed the Marin 101 Congestion Map 2002, indicating A.M. and P.M. direction congestion. Next, Julie Gumm conducted a presentation on Regional System Management Priorities. Ms. Gumm is responsible for developing and implementing a traffic operations strategic plan, which provides guidance and assists in establishing priorities for Bay Area traffic operations and related projects. Her team looks at existing problems, and if future traffic data is available, they will identify future operational problems and use that information for long-term planning for operational improvements.

They have separated the Bay Area into 24 corridors; Route 101 through Marin is considered Corridor #1. An example of an operational strategy through a corridor is Marin/101. Caltrans invested in the HOV strategy as their major operational strategy. Other types of strategies include ramp-metering, transit and intermodal connectivity, like Park & Ride lots (i.e., Manzanita), and "Smart Corridors" such as San Pablo Avenue in Alameda County. The objective of these strategies is to increase the people-carrying capacity.

Caltrans likes to conduct "Better Incidence Management" during reoccurring congestion problems. 50% of Bay Area congestion is what Caltrans calls "non-recurrent" whereby Caltrans utilizes traffic operations system equipment, such as changeable message signs, closed circuit TV's, and highway advisory radio. Caltrans has a Traffic Management Center (TMC) which is their communications hub into which all information flows.

Caltrans' ultimate Traffic Operations System (TOS) plan is to install a closed-circuit TV on every mile of Caltrans' maintained roadways, and CMS signs at every major decision point, and all traffic information stations would be approximately ½-mile apart! An investment of \$225M was made in the existing system. During the RTP process last November/December; Caltrans submitted approximately \$312M worth of priority, Bay Area system management projects. \$250K is projected for future 10-year SHOPP projects. Caltrans' ultimate build-out is projected at \$790M.

After Caltrans submitted the \$312M projects into the RTP process, MTC adopted Resolution 3609 in December 2003. The resolution recommended the regional policy include TOS in all major freeway projects; to confirm high priority system management needs; to recommend the most effective allocation of a \$55M regional set-aside available through MTC over the next 25 years; and, finally, to determine un-funded high-priority needs, a.k.a. the big tent.

After meeting in January 2004, the Bay Area CMA Directors volunteered staff to work with MTC and Caltrans, forming the Bay Area Freeway System Management Working Group. Included in the Group

were Alameda CMA, VTA, C/CAG and Solano Transportation Authority. Ms. Gumm explained the Working Group's Transportation 2030 Policy, adopted March 2004, detailing the Commission's requests of Caltrans.

Ms. Gumm said the annual operations and maintenance costs for operational, out of order, functional, and incomplete TOS projects equipment (covering existing inventory only) is \$6.4M. She listed the prioritization criteria for the ITS infrastructure: location, principles, benefit, and other considerations. If Caltrans receives \$55M over a 25-year span, that is \$2M on average per year, paring-down priorities.

A map of District 4's Traffic Operations System was presented, indicating percentages of field equipment installed on state highway routes. Also shown was a map of 650+ mile Bay Area highway projects with TOS elements, divided into two categories: STIP programmed projects and SHOPP programmed projects. Next, the 2002 Bay Area's top ten congestion locations/routes were illustrated, featuring Marin's Highway 101 corridor, ranked at #9.

The next step for the working group and others, according to Ms. Gumm, will be to examine funding policy recommendations, realizing that operating and sustaining the system is top-priority; seeking federal funds; ensuring system management projects are included in new funding programs; and, a data exchange with Smart corridors. The process should feature Caltrans, MTC and the Bay Area CMAs working together to review system management priorities on an annual basis.

Caltrans' estimated total funds needed for their initial 5-year plan is \$19.94M. Based on congestion locations and other factors, Marin's priority system management investments, pending future funding, would be the Marin-101 TOS Implementation, providing partial completion of system management hardware on Highway 101 between the Golden Gate Bridge and Novato, with the installation of CCTV cameras, changeable message signs, detector stations, and a highway advisory radio transmitter. In addition, to fill the detector gap on Highway 101 at the Golden Gate Bridge, install a detector station at the north end of the Golden Gate Bridge, @ Bowers Vista Point. Commissioner Heller asked about future funding for the detector gap on Highway 101 at the Golden Gate Bridge and if it could possibly be made a top priority for safety reasons. Julie Gumm said it could be considered for higher priority status. Top priority future funding issues are to be presented to MTC soon.

Commissioner Albritton was in favor of additional funding for ITS. His concern, however, is with the 20-year plan, and if Caltrans is considering changes in technology over this 20-year period. Systems like 511 and FasTrak are already measuring our speeds; cars are already equipped with GPS units, etc. Ms. Gumm said the intention of the working group is to meet regularly to discuss issues such as these, and to refine the equipment, processes and technology. Commissioner Albritton said that the \$3.5M allocated to this region 6 years from now may be better spent on FasTrak tracking, rather than changeable message signs or CCTV's.

Commissioner Eklund asked how many TV cameras would be on the high priority system management investment recommendation list for Marin. Ms. Gumm said there are 8 operational TV's in Marin; 3 are considered incomplete. Commissioner Eklund asked if the 3 incomplete installations were the only projects funded out of the program in Marin. Julie Gumm said yes, plus one additional project, which is to repair a CMS close to the Golden Gate Bridge for approximately \$100K, and is part of the funding for the first 5 years of the plan.

TAM then took public comments:

Don Wilhelm asked about the East Blithedale Project, requesting elaboration on its open issues, and if in fact the TAM, Mill Valley City Council and BOS are to approve this project? Caltrans' Jit Pandher said once there was consensus (between the authorities), Caltrans will determine whether or not to begin the project, and what the priorities are. Chair Kinsey confirmed that the project, in its entirety,

was within Caltrans' right of way. Mr. Pandher said temporary construction easements may need to be determined/issued. Commissioner Rose reminded the TAM that this issue was addressed by the BOS, which sent a letter to Caltrans with a number of suggestions and questions, to which a reply has not been made. A series of issues will have to be presented to the public as well as to all Boards.

Margaret said the Countywide Plan will be available September 28, 2004; she wished to address scenic highway standards, and asked that there be coordination between Caltrans and TAM to agree on bicycle and multi-purpose pathways issues with regard to scenic status.

6) Presentation of Draft Local Transportation for Livable Communities and Housing Incentive Program (TLC/HIP) Guidelines

Trent Lethco explained the nature of the program, created by MTC, with federal and state funding. Marin's one of the first County's out-the-door with TLC and HIP programs. It is still a pilot, therefore there is room for creativity and change. The T-PLUS advisory committee spent a lot of time discussing the grant programs; by and large, they reached general consensus. The group now wishes TAM's feedback. The grant in question tonight is derived from the regional transportation global community's' program, the regional housing incentives program, both of which are administered by MTC. There will be TOD and PeD guidelines. The grant programs are both regional and local, which connects transportation land use planning.

The program is focused on downtown, central districts, and community centers, which are focused on transit corridors. It appeals to, and provides incentives for, decision makers, and local communities, not so much housing developers. The grants are relatively small but can have a large impact. The funds are based on population; Marin will have a \$323,000 annual program. Mr. Lethco spoke of enhancing communities and overall quality of life. The T-PLUS AC has recommended 2 programs, both a local TLC capital program and a local housing incentives program. MTC threw it open to all counties, indicating it is up to each respective County as to what the county would like to do. The advisory committee supported a work force housing initiative.

As these are federal dollars up for grabs, the 11.5% match requirement is a part of the program. Local match means local fund sources. We can do anything, from bike, ped and transit enhancements. Mr. Lethco proposed those funds get pooled together to have a larger impact of dollars. Mr. Lethco suggested Marin offer grants from \$150K to \$500K.

Funds are awarded to local jurisdictions. Mr. Lethco explained that HIP dollars are transportation dollars that go toward transportation projects. The housing needs to be within a 1/3-mile of the transit stop; for rail and ferry service, it can spread to 1/2-mile. Mr. Lethco calculated the HIP award, and explained density thresholds. He listed the cities which, based on a cursory analysis, will have eligible projects to participate through the HIP (see page 5 of handout). Once a city has reached the point of discussing an application with a developer, it can submit an application to the TAM or MTC to reserve funds. Then, the permitting process begins and an eligibility determination is made.

The TLC Capital Program is different. There's not a housing program as part of the capital program, funds are awarded to local jurisdictions. Applications are submitted, reviewed, ranked, and scored against one another and the most competitive applicants receive grant funds. These are typically community based transportation projects (non-motorized bicycle/pedestrian or transit enhancements). Mr. Lethco and staff are proposing is that with a 3-year pool of funds, there be an open call for projects. As local jurisdictions find they have projects which meet HIP eligibility requirements, they notify TAM, and TAM reserves the funds for those local jurisdictions should they meet the local requirements. At the end of 3 years, if all funds have been claimed and spent, the call is closed. If

funds are left on the table, there is a call for TLC capital projects. Those without housing elements can apply, and use those funds for other types of projects in their jurisdiction.

There will be technical assistance workshops and outreach to let the community know housing incentive programs available. It is important to have annual evaluations and report to MTC to inform them as to how the projects are working in Marin.

There are 4 key questions for the program: 1) Does TAM want to offer both programs; 2) Have we 'got it right' in terms of both capital grant program and the housing incentive program; 3) ; the smaller grant size is somewhat of an exception to TAM staff recommendations of setting a floor of approximately \$500K for projects using federal funds, which opens the process to more cities in Marin County; and finally, 4) does the process make sense?

Provided there's Board adoption, they can move forward with a Call for Projects; at the same time, there's a regional call happening at the same time (in November) for the housing incentive program, and, again in February for the TLC program at the regional level.

Commissioner Tremaine said there is a list of communities which will likely qualify for the HIP program; he wanted clarity as to how that conclusion was met. Mr. Lethco explained they have looked at what has been done in the past, and what is possible in the future, based on housing elements in the General Plan. They estimated how many housing units could be produced, at a minimum of 20 units per acre, within the distance parameters of transit stops. Then they determined what dollar amount they would receive, and considered if that would be enough to reach \$150K. Chair Kinsey said it is obvious the goal is to encourage high-density development close to transit, which is why some communities would fall out of eligibility.

Commissioner Eklund questioned about Novato's eligible sites. Mr. Lethco said they were presenting a ballpark estimate as to who might be able to participate and at what levels. Commissioner Eklund asked if the recommendation was to wait until the end of the 3-year cycle to call for proposals for the capital aspect of projects. Mr. Lethco said that rather than doing a single-point-in-time call for projects for the housing incentive program, they wanted to have an open period of time over the 3-years, where at any point a jurisdiction could come in. The County programs still have to be plugged into the regional process. MTC's mapping out what is the best regional time-points; local jurisdictions have another opportunity to access TLC or HIP funds through these County-level programs. Commissioner Eklund also asked whom the decision maker would be. Mr. Lethco said there would be an eligibility screening, so that it wouldn't have to come in front of a Board, yet as a project is approved for expenditures, that is what would go before the Board.

Commissioner Tremaine said that by design, if there is a program that ties the street and pedestrian improvements with a housing program, it is going to be looked upon more favorable, correct. Mr. Lethco said if a housing project fits the eligibility requirement when it is in the appropriate place in the process, you go in, and the funds are granted to you. Should you have a capital application, that does not have a housing project, then it would be competitive. HIP is on eligibility and first-come, first-serve basis. As people apply for the funds, they are reserved until the funds have been expended. The awards are capped at \$500K.

Chair Kinsey reminded the group that a \$1M of reprogrammed TLC funds went to the Cal Park Hill Tunnel rehabilitation; sometimes reprogramming works.

Commissioner Adams requested clarity on the upside and downside of whether TAM should offer both local HIP and TLC funding/programming. The AC, according to Mr. Lethco, said they wanted to offer both. If only a housing incentive program was offered, other meritorious transportation projects in local jurisdictions which are not creating housing might be denied. They really wanted to tilt the

program in favor of housing, followed-up by the TLC program. Commissioner Adams asked if there was a way for the community to generate the request, or does it all come from the city. Mr. Lethco said yes, requests need to come from the cities. One difference between County level programs versus regional programs is that regional programs offer planning funds. A local community group can apply, saying, "... we're really interested in looking at pedestrian connections from our schools to such-n'-such park..."; MTC then takes its own operating funds, sets them aside to do planning related activities throughout the region, on the local level. Commissioner Adams spoke of the Marinwood Plaza, featuring 77 units of housing with retail; she said she did not see this area (Miller Creek and Las Gallinas) in the queue for consideration. Mr. Lethco said the list is illustrative.

Commissioner Albritton asked about the HIP capital portion of the program, and whether that was not to assist in prioritizing the TLC funding. Mr. Lethco said it is one type of funding. Sausalito, for example, applies for TLC funding annually. Commissioner Albritton also said that the money involved in the HIP incentive does not seem worth the effort to go through the process. He said he is not sure that prioritizing by housing projects is going to be a high priority, given the amount of effort it takes to do a single housing project; and, yes, Sausalito does wish for more TLC money.

Chair Kinsey said that because there are not so many dollars, he is not sure if he is supportive of smaller grants. It is possible that TAM should take the recommendation, get 'out there' and see, in the first round, what kinds of proposals are submitted. Yet, with a limited amount of dollars, he'd like not to see a smattering of projects that create great signage and character, yet do not really make lasting impressions on our system, promoting housing near transit. Commissioner Tremaine spoke of Fairfax's efforts toward gleaning TLC funds for its Center Boulevard project. Commissioner Albritton said the TLC funding does not have to be equivalent to the whole grant, either. Sausalito combined it with other sources of funds.

Mr. Lethco explained that projects wanting to compete regionally can also use the local programs. MTC can decide to fund all or part; a project sponsor can approach the TAM and plead for additional monies.

Commissioner Chu said Larkspur may not be qualified to receive this type of funding, yet they provide other areas of Marin with something to vie for. As this is a trial, let us see what type of applications come in.

TAM then took public comments:

Barbara Collins talked about developable nets and gross, pertaining to page 5 of CD&A's presentation. Phil Erickson said they looked back at the last 3 issues of a net-acreage database on what the County maintains with the local jurisdictions. They gathered the housing elements they could from local jurisdictions, and made an interpretation of those. The calculations ballpark estimates as to how each community might compete for monies.

Wendy Kallins, a T-PLUS committee representative, spoke about prioritizing HIP over the TLC program. She said the process is flawed; that priority will be given to those projects that include housing, rather than evaluating projects which are developing good transportation projects. There is still a greater need for better connectivity to transportation areas. She asked the TAM to really consider this, and, to reverse the priority of the two programs after 3 years, to even out any favoritism.

Nancy Weninger with MCBC, questioned to what extent the availability of the \$150K to \$500K in a multi-million project is going to be an incentive to a developer. Is there an open eligibility period for the HIP process? Mr. Lethco said there are levels of criterion that need to be met prior to granting funds. They want to put dollars in jurisdictions creating housing because part of the transportation

problem is that housing is not being created near transit. Nancy suggested they all be TLC projects, and all be openly competitive, making housing a criteria for evaluation.

Karen Nygren said that if HIP is chosen over TLC, only 2 communities will benefit in all of Marin: San Rafael and Novato.

The goal is to come back to TAM next month, according to Chair Kinsey. He said that unless there is strong opposition at next months' meeting, the recommendations of the Advisory Committee will be approved. Commissioner Eklund asked if a conscious decision could be made to look at this program in a year and then evaluate it; especially, if there are no applications for HIP. Yes, Mr. Lethco suggested it be considered a pilot program.

7) Presentation of Draft Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) AND Pedestrian-Oriented Design (PeD) Toolkit Principles, Issues, and Barriers

Carey Lando, Senior Transportation Planner, said beginning in FY 2003-04, MTC will provide to each of the Bay Area Counties \$150K per year for 3 years to link County transportation and land use planning activities. Marin's work program for the Transportation Planning & Land Use Solutions (T-PLUS) focuses on the development of the transit-oriented and pedestrian design best practices tool kit, as well as the development, coordination and administration of a capital grant program, called the Local TLC HIP, or Transportation for Livable Communities and Housing Incentive Program. A T-PLUS AC was composed of representatives of regional planning agencies, city council members, as well as Public Works, transit agencies and citizens and interest group representatives. This advisory group met several times to provide feedback and guidance to staff on the T-PLUS work products. The T-PLUS AC worked with staff to shape the work products shown (as presented tonight). Staff received a letter from County CDA on draft local TLC HIP program guidelines; Ms. Lando thanked CDA for their continued comments and involvement with the T-PLUS work program. TAM will work closely with CDA to ensure their comments are included in the final program guidelines, which will be brought back to TAM Commissioners next month.

As part of the 3-year T-PLUS work program, Marin retained an outside consultant team to prepare the work products. Ms. Lando introduced Phil Erickson and Thomas Kronemeyer from Community Design and Architecture (CD&A), and Trent Lethco from ARUP.

Mr. Phil Erickson introduced the vision statement and explained the principles, local goals and benefits, plus issues and barriers of the T-PLUS. Mr. Erickson discussed the land use patterns in existing transit service in Marin, since transit oriented development is of major concern. Using MTC guidelines, Mr. Erickson said that in looking at a 1/3-mile walking distance (a map was presented), there appears to be sufficient transit service frequency for the area between Novato and central San Rafael, therefore, transit-oriented development is feasible. Pedestrian-oriented design is equally important as an integral element. There are issues regarding County transit funding; the point of this program is to build a physical environment to work well with future transit.

Congestion is seen as having a negative impact on the quality of life for Marin residents. The concerns are limited convenience and access to transit; discontinuous elements with roadway networks, sidewalks, bicycle routes, etc. Housing choice is a large issue, too. The advisory committee worked with CD&A to devise a vision statement, including a broad range of housing choice, minimizing environmental impact. There are 6 principles distilled from the work done to date. Their goals are related to the principles; from that, policies were derived.

The goal is to create a transit-oriented development and pedestrian designed tool kit. The tool kit focuses on modal policies, programs, and guidelines that TAM can establish for the communities.

The tool kit can be used to educate the community and decision makers about the benefits and barriers of TOD.

Working from discussions with the advisory committee and stakeholder groups, CD&A began to ascertain barriers. Issue-areas became an organizing element. The issues were distilled into 4 areas: 1) There are some inconsistencies in land use and transportation policies in the County's existing policy documents; 2) there are funding needs for transit and community planning; 3) concerns regarding existing conditions of transportation network in Marin, and protected open space; and, 4) educational aspect of the tool kit, about transit-oriented development. There is a negative attitude toward high-capacity transit, and intensification of land use.

Mr. Erickson listed their and the communities' next steps. They will come back to TAM in October to receive ratification of their compiled documents. They will develop the tool kit and still reach out to stakeholders to continue to receive input. In spring of 2005, they will have the final draft of the TOD tool kit.

Commissioner Heller asked about the four issues area and related barriers; does that include all of the Marin local agencies? Mr. Erickson said they did not poll individual communities. The lack of funding concern permeated the more detailed planning that could help implement transit-oriented development. Commissioner Chu complimented staff and the CD&A for organizing all of the matrix's information, encapsulated into tonight's report. He suggested the TAM review the report carefully so that the TAM could offer its educated feedback to show everyone's on the right track.

Commissioner Fredericks questioned the process related to the representation of local goals, and referred to page 6, regarding the Corte Madera Community Design element, referring to creating outstanding neighborhood character. The remaining general plans referred to existing neighborhood character. Commissioner Fredericks asked for clarification of the neighborhood character issue. Mr. Erickson said the issues are not contradictory. The principle in question supports the distinct character of Marin Communities and while Corte Madera, in the goal they have selected discuss creating character; all three are concerned about the character of the community. Commissioner Fredericks suggested someone might present a new project creating a new residential character, and the existing neighbors might argue that the neighborhood should look this way or that. Therefore, how will clarifications make their way into the tool kit as final text? Phil Erickson said they would again review the Corte Madera document, speak to the Town of Corte Madera, and learn their precise intent regarding neighborhood character. This is an issue of wordsmith, not necessarily one of conflict.

Commissioner Eklund complimented CD&A's efforts, and reiterated the Governor's pedestrian-friendly goals of neighborhood and character. Commissioner Eklund offered the Governor's snapshot of the growing obesity of our children, and their not walking to a neighborhood friends' home, but asking that their parents drive them to and from. A more pedestrian-friendly concept/effort should be developed, promoted, and initiated. For example, there are areas of Novato which are still growing and need this exact foresight of planning. She also brought up CD&A's figure that only 11% of Marin is developed; she suggested indicating that a certain percentage of Marin is developable. In addition, on page 7, she requested a definition of "...major transit corridors..." Ms. Eklund spoke of CD&A's view of the Novato's transit-corridors which could be of higher density; she asked this be defined or eliminated. She also asked about CD&A's reference to the Countywide Plan's notation of "nodes". Regarding coordinating land use and transportation related planning efforts, Commissioner Eklund said a good tool exists which is one to develop joint specific plans between the County and the cities, regarding specific areas, such as Gnos Air Field. Issues related to parking and height restrictions were mentioned by Commissioner Eklund, who said Novato does not allow for four-story structures.

Commissioner Adams said that on page 3, "...targeting new developmental areas already developed", might be consideration for discussion on brown field sites, as there are a number of those areas which

might be reutilized. Another issue raised was that of highlighting access ways; not just bicycle and pedestrian friendly ways but also disabled-friendly ways. It is important CD&A's document reflect this.

Chair Kinsey said the recognition identified tonight is that there is not a lot of money for Marin. These formulas, when applied to larger counties, provide for serious substantial funds to work on those counties' issues, yet in Marin, it does not provide us the ability. We need to look at the few, quality projects which will benefit our community as a whole. Our regional transit corridors are where we should place our emphasis. Focusing on multi-modal transit hubs previously discussed would be a great place to begin. This is how the TAM and the BOS can bring in the 'affordable housing' piece, as opposed to having separate program for housing incentives. One of the tool kit elements useful for the community at large is to help develop 21st century parking ratios and get them adopted. We are still living in a suburban model.

TAM then took public comments:

Karen Nygren said discussion is needed on how TAM can implement and do something under CD&A's principled recommendations. This body needs to lead and coordinate the implementation of the transportation piece as a principle and develop a goal as to how to achieve this.

- 8) Authorize Chair to Execute an Addendum to Professional Services Agreement with CD+A to Extend Consulting Services Related to the Transportation Planning and Land Use Solutions (TPLUS) Work Program

Commissioner Eklund moved to authorize the Chair to execute an addendum to a Professional Services Agreement with CD+A to extend their consulting services; Commissioner Albritton seconded the motion. Motion passed 11/0/5.

- 9) Regional Measure 2 Update and Subcommittee Appointment

Executive Director Tackabery explained that at the July meeting, TAM adopted a resolution requesting staff to go forth with requesting funding from MTC for hiring an additional staff member. \$3.5M was approved yesterday for staffing and the environmental document for the 101/Greenbrae Corridor project. We received several letters regarding this project, provided in the supplemental packet; we are working on collecting all of the studies and the minutes and the initial project report. Our intent is to provide all of the information on our web page.

Chair Kinsey said we have been given the go-ahead to get a project manager and the suggestion that TAM would be the overall lead-agency for these variety of different projects along the central 101 corridor. We also want a consultant working with that project manager on board, before we start a community process so that we can adequately support it. He said we would like to see Corte Madera and Larkspur have representation on this subcommittee; plus, supervisors of those areas, plus an at-large representation to ensure the ideas are regional in thought as well.

Commissioner Chu said that in the original discussion Supervisor Brown would be a representative; in terms of a second supervisor, it would be of interest to a municipality who may be adjoining to the project area, such as Mill Valley or San Rafael. Chair Kinsey said we do not need to make the appointments this evening.

Commissioner Eklund moved to accept the subcommittees' structure, with at-large representation; Commissioner Tremaine seconded the motion. Motion passed 11/0/5.

- 10) Progress Report from Subcommittee on Fixed-Route Local Transit Service Contract Between Marin County Transit District and Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District and Provide Direction to Staff Regarding Potential Use of Sales Tax Funds Allocated to Transit

Chair Kinsey said that since last meeting of TAM, the reason for the subcommittee is that the Marin County Transit District is a special district, created by a vote of the people, and has the benefit of the use of property taxes, which are not transferable to any other agency. It does not have enough funds to maintain existing service. Additional revenues will come from the successful passage of Measure A, which actually provides funding to TAM, not directly to the district. As of this evening, we do not have a completed negotiation with the GGBH&TD to say definitively what percentage of the transit dollars MCTD is asking TAM for. At the October 28th meeting, we can recommend a 'pass through relationship' for at least the first period of the sales tax measure.

- 11) Request from Commissioner Breen to Review Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County

Commissioner Breen was absent; no action was taken.

- 12) Request to Oppose California Propositions 68 and 70 (November 2, 2004 General Election), Concerning Tribal Gaming Compacts

Commissioner Murray moved to oppose the propositions; Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Motion passed 11/0/5.

- 13) Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

None offered.

- 14) Open Time for Items Not On the Agenda

None.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the TAM meeting at 9:55 p.m.